

The Department of State

FEB 1 1956

bulletin

XXXIV, No. 864

January 16, 1956



THE STATE OF THE UNION • Excerpts From President Eisenhower's Message to the Congress	79
VISIT OF PRESIDENT-ELECT KUBITSCHKE OF BRAZIL	86
APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CON- TROLLING LEVELS OF LAKE ONTARIO	89
FUTURE STATUS OF TOGOLAND	
<i>Statement by Laird Bell</i>	100
<i>Text of Resolution</i>	102
SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY	97

For index see inside back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXXIV, No. 864 • PUBLICATION 6241

January 16, 1956

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The State of the Union

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS (EXCERPTS)¹

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The opening of this new year must arouse in us all grateful thanks to a kind Providence whose protection has been ever present and whose bounty has been manifold and abundant. The state of the Union today demonstrates what can be accomplished under God by a free people; by their vision, their understanding of national problems, their initiative, their self-reliance, their capacity for work—and by their willingness to sacrifice whenever sacrifice is needed.

In the past 3 years, responding to what our people want their Government to do, the Congress and the Executive have done much in building a stronger, better America. There has been broad progress in fostering the energies of our people, in providing greater opportunity for the satisfaction of their needs, and in fulfilling their demands for the strength and security of the Republic.

Our country is at peace. Our security posture commands respect. A spiritual vigor marks our national life. Our economy, approaching the 400-billion-dollar mark, is at an unparalleled level of prosperity. The national income is more widely and fairly distributed than ever before. The number of Americans at work has reached an all-time high. As a people we are achieving ever higher standards of living—earning more, producing more, consuming more, building more, and investing more than ever before.

Virtually all sectors of our society are sharing in these good times. Our farm families, if we act wisely, imaginatively, and promptly to strengthen our present farm programs, can also look forward to sharing equitably in the prosperity they have helped to create.

¹Read to the Senate and the House of Representatives on Jan. 5 (H. doc. 241, 84th Cong., 2d sess.).

War in Korea ended 2½ years ago. The collective security system has been powerfully strengthened. Our defenses have been reinforced at sharply reduced costs. Programs to expand world trade and to harness the atom for the betterment of mankind have been carried forward. Our economy has been freed from governmental wage and price controls. Inflation has been halted, the cost of living stabilized.

Government spending has been cut by more than \$10 billion. Nearly 300,000 positions have been eliminated from the Federal payroll. Taxes have been substantially reduced. A balanced budget is in prospect. Social security has been extended to 10 million more Americans and unemployment insurance to 4 million more. Unprecedented advances in civil rights have been made. The long-standing and deep-seated problems of agriculture have been forthrightly attacked.

This record of progress has been accomplished with a self-imposed caution against unnecessary and unwise interference in the private affairs of our people, of their communities, and of the several States.

If we of the executive and legislative branches, keeping this caution ever in mind, address ourselves to the business of the year before us—and to the unfinished business of last year—with resolution, the outlook is bright with promise.

Many measures of great national importance recommended last year to the Congress still demand immediate attention—legislation for school and highway construction; health and immigration legislation; water resources legislation; legislation to complete the implementation of our foreign economic policy; such labor legislation as amendments of the Labor-Management Relations Act, extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to

additional groups not now covered, and occupational safety legislation; and legislation for construction of an atomic-powered exhibit vessel.

Many new items of business likewise require our attention—measures that will further promote the release of the energies of our people; that will broaden opportunity for all of them; that will advance the Republic in its leadership toward a just peace—measures, in short, that are essential to the building of an ever-stronger, ever-better America.

Every political and economic guide supports a valid confidence that wise effort will be rewarded by an even more plentiful harvest of human benefit than we now enjoy. Our resources are too many, our principles too dynamic, our purposes too worthy, and the issues at stake too immense for us to entertain doubt or fear. But our responsibilities require that we approach this year's business with a sober humility.

A heedless pride in our present strength and position would blind us to the facts of the past, to the pitfalls of the future. We must walk ever in the knowledge that we are enriched by a heritage earned in the labor and sacrifice of our forebears; that, for our children's children, we are trustees of a great Republic and a time-tested political system; that we prosper as a cooperating member of the family of nations.

In this light, the administration has continued work on its program for the Republic, begun 3 years ago. Because the vast spread of national and human interests is involved within it, I shall not in this message attempt its detailed delineation. Instead, from time to time during this session there will be submitted to the Congress specific recommendations within specific fields. In the comprehensive survey required for their preparation, the administration is guided by enduring objectives. The first is:

The Discharge of Our World Responsibility

Our world policy and our actions are dedicated to the achievement of peace with justice for all nations.

With this purpose we move in a wide variety of ways and through many agencies to remove the pall of fear; to strengthen the ties with our partners and to improve the cooperative cohesion of the free world; to reduce the burden of armaments; and to stimulate and inspire action among

all nations for a world of justice and prosperity and peace. These national objectives are fully supported by both our political parties.

In the past year our search for a more stable and just peace has taken varied forms. Among the most important were the two conferences at Geneva, in July and in the fall of last year. We explored the possibilities of agreement on critical issues that jeopardize the peace.

The July meeting of Heads of Government held out promise to the world of moderation in the bitterness, of word and action, which tends to generate conflict and war. All were in agreement that a nuclear war would be an intolerable disaster which must not be permitted to occur. But in October, when the Foreign Ministers met again, the results demonstrated conclusively that the Soviet leaders are not yet willing to create the indispensable conditions for a secure and lasting peace.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the conflict between international communism and freedom has taken on a new complexion.

We know the Communist leaders have often practiced the tactics of retreat and zigzag. We know that Soviet and Chinese communism still poses a serious threat to the free world. And in the Middle East recent Soviet moves are hardly compatible with the reduction of international tension.

Yet Communist tactics against the free nations have shifted in emphasis from reliance on violence and the threat of violence to reliance on division, enticement, and duplicity. We must be well prepared to meet the current tactics, which pose a dangerous though less obvious threat. At the same time our policy must be dynamic as well as flexible, designed primarily to forward the achievement of our own objectives rather than to meet each shift and change on the Communist front. We must act in the firm assurance that the fruits of freedom are more attractive and desirable to mankind in the pursuit of happiness than the record of communism.

In the face of Communist military power, we must, of course, continue to maintain an effective system of collective security. This involves two things—a system which gives clear warning that armed aggression will be met by joint action of the free nations and deterrent military power to make that warning effective. Moreover, the awesome power of the atom must be made to serve

as a guardian of the free community and of the peace.

In the last year the free world has seen major gains for the system of collective security: the accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Western European Union of the sovereign Federal German Republic; the developing cooperation under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty; and the formation in the Middle East of the Baghdad Pact among Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. In our own hemisphere the inter-American system has continued to show its vitality in maintaining peace and a common approach to world problems. We now have security pacts with more than 40 other nations.

In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever-increasing influence and usefulness. In the release of our 15 fliers from Communist China, an essential prelude was the world opinion mobilized by the General Assembly which condemned their imprisonment and demanded their liberation. The successful atomic energy conference held in Geneva under United Nations auspices and our atoms-for-peace program have been practical steps toward the worldwide use of this new energy source. Our sponsorship of such use has benefited our relations with other countries. Active negotiations are now in progress to create an international agency to foster peaceful uses of atomic energy.

During the past year the crucial problem of disarmament has moved to the forefront of practical political endeavor. At Geneva I declared the readiness of the United States to exchange blueprints of the military establishments of our nation and the U.S.S.R., to be confirmed by reciprocal aerial reconnaissance. By this means I felt mutual suspicions could be allayed and an atmosphere developed in which negotiations looking toward limitation of arms would have improved chances of success.

In the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament last fall, this proposal was explored and the United States also declared itself willing to include reciprocal ground inspection of key points. By the overwhelming vote of 56 to 7, the United Nations on December 16 endorsed these proposals and gave them a top priority.² Thereby,

the issue is placed squarely before the bar of world opinion. We shall persevere in seeking a general reduction of armaments under effective inspection and control, which are essential safeguards to insure reciprocity and protect the security of all.

In the coming year much remains to be done.

While maintaining our military deterrent, we must intensify our efforts to achieve a just peace. In Asia we shall continue to give help to nations struggling to maintain their freedom against the threat of Communist coercion or subversion. In Europe we shall endeavor to increase not only the military strength of the North Atlantic alliance but also its political cohesion and unity of purpose. We shall give such assistance as is feasible to the recently renewed effort of Western European nations to achieve a greater measure of integration, such as in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In the Near East we shall spare no effort in seeking to promote a fair solution of the tragic dispute between the Arab States and Israel, all of whom we want as our friends. The United States is ready to do its part to assure enduring peace in that area. We hope that both sides will make the contributions necessary to achieve that purpose. In Latin America we shall continue to cooperate vigorously in trade and other measures designed to assist economic progress in the area.

Strong economic ties are an essential element in our free-world partnership. Increasing trade and investment help all of us prosper together. Gratifying progress has been made in this direction, most recently by the 3-year extension of our trade-agreements legislation.

I most earnestly request that the Congress approve our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation,³ which would assist the carrying out of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to which we have been a party since 1948. Our membership in the OTC will provide the most effective and expeditious means for removing discriminations and restrictions against American exports and in making our trade agreements truly reciprocal. United States membership in the Organization will evidence our continuing desire to cooperate in promoting an expanded

² For a Presidential message on OTC, see *ibid.*, Apr. 25, 1955, p. 678; for text of OTC agreement, see *ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1955, p. 579.

³ BULLETIN of Jan. 9, 1956, p. 63.

trade among the free nations. Thus the Organization, as proposed, is admirably suited to our own interests and to those of like-minded nations in working for steady expansion of trade and closer economic cooperation. Being strictly an administrative entity, the Organization for Trade Cooperation cannot, of course, alter the control by Congress of the tariff, import, and customs policies of the United States.

We need to encourage investment overseas by avoiding unfair tax duplications, and to foster foreign trade by further simplification and improvement of our customs legislation.

We must sustain and fortify our Mutual Security Program. Because the conditions of poverty and unrest in less developed areas make their people a special target of international communism, there is a need to help them achieve the economic growth and stability necessary to preserve their independence against Communist threats and enticements.

In order that our friends may better achieve the greater strength that is our common goal, they need assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects and programs which we approve and which require a period of years for planning and completion. Accordingly, I ask Congress to grant limited authority to make longer-term commitments for assistance to such projects, to be fulfilled from appropriations to be made in future fiscal years.

These various steps will powerfully strengthen the economic foundation of our foreign policy. Together with constructive action abroad, they will maintain the present momentum toward general economic progress and vitality of the free world.

In all things, change is the inexorable law of life. In much of the world the ferment of change is working strongly; but grave injustices are still uncorrected. We must not, by any sanction of ours, help to perpetuate these wrongs. I have particularly in mind the oppressive division of the German people, the bondage of millions elsewhere, and the exclusion of Japan from United Nations membership.

We shall keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness and seek to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and secure peace.

Injustice thrives on ignorance. Because an un-

derstanding of the truth about America is one of our most powerful forces, I am recommending a substantial increase in budgetary support of the United States Information Agency.

The sum of our international effort should be this: the waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war. In this effort our weapon is not force. Our weapons are the principles and ideas embodied in our historic traditions, applied with the same vigor that in the past made America a living promise of freedom for all mankind.

To accomplish these vital tasks, all of us should be concerned with the strength, effectiveness, and morale of our State Department and our Foreign Service.

Another guide in the preparation of the administration's program is:

The Constant Improvement of Our National Security

Because peace is the keystone of our national policy, our defense program emphasizes an effective flexible type of power calculated to deter or repulse any aggression and to preserve the peace. Short of war we have never had military strength better adapted to our needs with improved readiness for emergency use. The maintenance of this strong military capability for the indefinite future will continue to call for a large share of our national budget. Our military programs must meet the needs of today. To build less would expose the Nation to aggression. To build excessively, under the influence of fear, could defeat our purposes and impair or destroy the very freedom and economic system our military defenses are designed to protect.

We have improved the effectiveness and combat readiness of our forces by developing and making operational new weapons and by integrating the latest scientific developments, including new atomic weapons, into our military plans. We continue to push the production of the most modern military aircraft. The development of long-range missiles has been on an accelerated basis for some time. We are moving as rapidly as practicable toward nuclear-powered aircraft and ships. Combat capability, especially in terms of firepower, has been substantially increased. We have made the adjustments in personnel permitted by

the cessation of the Korean war, the buildup of our allies, and the introduction of new weapons. The services are all planning realistically on a long-term basis.

To strengthen our continental defenses, the United States and Canada, in the closest cooperation, have substantially augmented early-warning networks. Great progress is being made in extending surveillance of the Arctic, the Atlantic, and the Pacific approaches to North America.

In the last analysis our real strength lies in the caliber of the men and women in our Armed Forces, active and reserve. Much has been done to attract and hold capable military personnel, but more needs to be done. This year I renew my request of last year for legislation to provide proper medical care for military dependents and a more equitable survivors' benefit program. The administration will prepare additional recommendations designed to achieve the same objectives, including career incentives for medical and dental officers and nurses, and increases in the proportion of regular officers.

Closely related to the mission of the Defense Department is the task of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. A particular point of relationship arises from the fact that the key to civil defense is the expanded continental defense program, including the distant-early-warning system. Our Federal civil defense authorities have made progress in their program, and now comprehensive studies are being conducted jointly by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the States, and critical target cities to determine the best procedures that can be adopted in case of an atomic attack. We must strengthen Federal assistance to the States and cities in devising the most effective common defense.

We have a broad and diversified mobilization base. We have the facilities, materials, skills, and knowledge rapidly to expand the production of things we need for our defense whenever they are required. But mobilization base requirements change with changing technology and strategy. We must maintain flexibility to meet new requirements. I am requesting, therefore, that the Congress once again extend the Defense Production Act.

Of great importance to our Nation's security is a continuing alertness to internal subversive activity within or without our Government. This administration will not relax its efforts to deal

forthrightly and vigorously in protection of this Government and its citizens against subversion, at the same time fully protecting the constitutional rights of all citizens.

Immigration Policy

In keeping with our responsibility of world leadership and in our own self-interest, I again point out to the Congress the urgent need for revision of the immigration and nationality laws. Our Nation has always welcomed immigrants to our shores. The wisdom of such a policy is clearly shown by the fact that America has been built by immigrants and the descendants of immigrants. That policy must be continued realistically with present-day conditions in mind.

I recommend that the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the latest, the 1950 census. Provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas so, if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries.

The law should be amended to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive the requirements of fingerprinting on a reciprocal basis for persons coming to this country for temporary visits. This and other changes in the law are long overdue and should be taken care of promptly. Detailed recommendations for revision of the immigration laws will be submitted to the Congress.

I am happy to report substantial progress in the flow of immigrants under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; however, I again request this Congress to approve without further delay the urgently needed amendments to that act which I submitted in the last session. Because of the high prosperity in Germany and Austria, the number of emigrants from those countries will be reduced. This will make available thousands of unfilled openings which I recommend be distributed to Greece and Italy and to escapees from behind the Iron Curtain.

To conclude: The vista before us is bright. The march of science, the expanding economy, the advance in collective security toward a just peace—in this threefold movement our people are creating

new standards by which the future of the Republic may be judged.

Progress, however, will be realized only as it is more than matched by a continuing growth in the spiritual strength of the Nation. Our dedication to moral values must be complete in our dealings abroad and in our relationships among ourselves. We have single-minded devotion to the common good of America. Never must we forget that this means the well-being, the prosperity, the security of all Americans in every walk of life.

To the attainment of these objectives I pledge full energies of the administration as, in the session ahead, it works on a program for submission to you, the Congress of the United States.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 5, 1956

Outlook for Free World in 1956

*Statement by Secretary Dulles*¹

The year 1955 has done much for peace. At the summit conference President Eisenhower showed the whole world the sincerity of our peaceful purpose. Germany entered into NATO, and the SEATO and Baghdad Pacts are now functioning in Asia. Thus the free world has done much to consolidate its position and to deter open war.

Now the Soviet Communist rulers turn to other devices. We can be confident that these, too, will fail and that 1956 will further extend the influence of freedom in the world.

Southeast Asia Pact Council To Meet at Karachi

Press release 12 dated January 6

The Foreign Ministers of the governments signatory to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty have agreed to meet at Karachi from March 6 to 8. This will be the second meeting of the SEATO Council, the first having been held at Bangkok in February 1955.² The Secretary of State will attend the Karachi meeting and plans to leave Washington about March 2.

¹ Released at New York, N.Y., on Dec. 31.

² BULLETIN of Mar. 7, 1955, p. 371.

United States Position on Liberation of Captive Peoples

*Statement by James C. Hagerty
Press Secretary to the President*

White House press release dated December 30

Mr. Khrushchev is reported to have said that the Christmas messages of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to the peoples of Eastern Europe "in no way accord with the spirit of Geneva."³

It was made abundantly clear at Geneva to the Soviet rulers that the "spirit of Geneva" could not and did not involve any relaxing of the peaceful purpose of the United States to achieve liberty and justice for the oppressed peoples of the world.

In his opening statement at Geneva, President Eisenhower said:

... there is the problem of respecting the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and of restoring sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been deprived of them. The American people feel strongly that certain peoples of Eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of this pledge of our United Nations wartime declaration, reinforced by other wartime agreements.

In his radio-television report to the American people immediately following the Geneva conference, President Eisenhower said:

... the Secretary of State and I specifically brought up, more than once, American convictions and American beliefs and American concern about such questions as the satellites of Eastern Europe and the activities of international communism. We made crystal clear what were American beliefs about such matters as these.

The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and, until success is achieved, will con-

³ The President's message, broadcast over Radio Free Europe, was as follows:

"During the Christmas season, I want you to know that the American people recognize the trials under which you are suffering; join you in your concern for the restoration of individual freedoms and political liberty; and share your faith that right in the end will prevail to bring you once again among the free nations of the world."

Secretary Dulles' message read as follows:

"On this first of all Christian holidays I join with the millions of Americans whose thoughts are with you. We share your firm faith in God. We look to the future with hope and resolution, confident that freedom and justice shall at last prevail."

tion
tinue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy.

U.S. Recognition of Independence of the Sudan

Greeting From President Eisenhower

Press release 1 dated January 2

President Eisenhower has sent the following greeting on the occasion of the recognition by the United States of the independence of the Sudan.¹

It gives me great pleasure to extend, on behalf of the American people, warmest greetings on the attainment of Sudanese independence. The Government of the United States looks forward to friendly relations with the Government of the Sudan and wishes you and your fellow countrymen every success in establishing a stable, prosperous and happy nation.

Department Announcement

Press release 2 dated January 2

The United States has extended recognition to the Sudan as an independent sovereign state. This action followed termination of the Anglo-Egyptian condominium in the Sudan and recognition of the Sudan's independence by Egypt and the United Kingdom. The U.S. Liaison Officer in Khartoum, Arthur E. Beach, presented the letter of recognition quoted below to the President of the Supreme Commission, which will exercise the powers of the Head of State:

"I have been requested by my Government to inform you that it has noted the declaration on

¹ Delivered on Jan. 2 by the U.S. Liaison Officer in Khartoum, Arthur E. Beach, to the President of the Supreme Commission.

December 19, 1955 by the Parliament of the Sudan proclaiming the Sudan as an independent sovereign state and is pleased to extend its official recognition. The Government of the United States contemplates the establishment of appropriate means for the conduct of formal diplomatic relations at an early date. The United States of America congratulates the people of the Sudan on their assumption of the powers, duties and responsibilities of independence and expresses the hope that in the adoption and maintenance of an independent form of government the rights, liberties and happiness of the Sudanese people will be secure and the progress of the country insured."

Mob Violence in Amman and Jerusalem

Press release 13 dated January 8

At the request of the Secretary of State, the Chargé d'Affaires of Jordan (Taysir A. Toukan) called upon the Secretary on January 8. Secretary Dulles expressed his deep concern at reports of mob violence occurring on January 7 in Amman and in the Jordan-occupied sector of Jerusalem. American property had been damaged and American lives had been endangered. It was obvious that the measures taken by the Jordan Government to prevent mob action had been inadequate to the situation.

The Secretary requested the Jordan representative to communicate urgently to his Government the importance of the Jordan Government's taking all necessary measures to protect American lives and property in Jordan.

Instructions to make similar representations have been sent to the American Ambassador at Amman (Ambassador Lester DeWitt Mallory) and the American Consul General in Jerusalem (Consul General William E. Cole, Jr.).

Visit of President-Elect Kubitschek of Brazil

Following are texts of statements made at Washington National Airport on the arrival of Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira, President-elect of Brazil, on January 5; an address which he delivered before the U.S. Senate on the same date; and an excerpt from his address to the National Press Club at Washington on January 6.

WELCOME AT AIRPORT

Press release 9 dated January 5

Remarks of Secretary Dulles

Mr. President-elect of Brazil, you have already been welcomed to the United States by President Eisenhower. That leaves little for me to do. President Eisenhower talked to me on the telephone after he had breakfast with you [at Key West] and told me of the great pleasure which he had in talking with you and making an acquaintance which we feel sure will help to strengthen the solidarity between our two countries.

There has long been a very close association between our countries. It goes back for many years when the United States, I think, was the first to recognize the newborn Republic of Brazil. We have fought together in World War I and in World War II. And your great country with its vast domain, its natural resources, and its growing population, drawn as ours is from many parts of the world, creates a basis for an ever-continuing and ever-closer association. We know that that will be promoted by your visit here and that you will find, Mr. President, a welcome by the American people, which is an indication of the very high regard which we feel for you and your country.

Response by Mr. Kubitschek

Mr. Dulles, it is with gratified emotion that I greet the American people. I took great pleasure in calling on President Eisenhower at Key

West and I was very glad to hear from him words that show how deeply he appreciates the need for continued cooperation between our two countries.

Since the days they were born, Brazil and the United States have come a long way together on the road of friendship and mutual understanding. We are neighbors by geography, brothers by soul, friends by tradition. We share the same ideals of democratic freedom and a common interest in defending our way of life from the inroads of doctrines opposed to our Christian beliefs.

I wish to bring you the assurance that the Brazilian people are firmly decided to fight for freedom and progress with the same determination that brought about the greatness of your country.

ADDRESS OF JANUARY 5¹

Mr. Vice President and Members of the Senate, it is with deep emotion that as President-elect of the United States of Brazil I am addressing this august assembly. My emotion is justifiable, for, on behalf of my country, I am speaking from one of the greatest of free platforms in the world to the stalwart, generous Nation to whom our civilization is indebted for timely support in some of the most perilous and perplexing hours of need that have ever befallen mankind.

Great as is your progress and that unequalled wealth and power which has vouchsafed you the highest form of social justice existing on earth, justice founded in the prosperity and dignity of the individual; great as is your industrial network, the fertility of your well-tilled fields, your very riches; nobler far is the heroic use you made of them in the near past, endangering them, twice in half a century, when oppression laid siege to what is for you, and for us too, the basic framework of civilization, and that is the freedom of

¹ Delivered in Portuguese and interpreted by A. José de Seabra of the Department of State; reprinted from *Cong. Rec.* of Jan. 5, 1956, p. 109.

man, the respect for man, unassailable in his conscience and in his rights, and the independence of his way of living.

Yet you did not sway the world merely by force of arms, but rather by faith in your ideals, by the unselfish exercise of power that you have proved morally fit to possess.

In the course of the last two wars in which you intervened, overcoming resistance from many a quarter and discarding multiple reasons that urged you to stay at home, you found my country at your side, unable to cooperate on the same scale as yours, but running the same risk.

Together we took part in the two conflagrations, not only from motives of continental solidarity, though this concept be firmly anchored in the Brazilian mentality, but also because we share the same ideals, the same sentiments, the same respect for the paramount dignity of man, that led you to take up arms and fight with unflinching valor.

I cannot fail to take this opportunity of paying homage to the young of your Nation who died for this great cause and express my gratitude for the services they have rendered to our countries and for all they have done so that we may live as we want to live: free and abiding by the Christian beliefs and principles of our upbringing, to which we aspire to remain faithful.

Nor should we forget the obligations we have assumed toward those whose devotion has gone as far as the sacrifice of life itself: these obligations consist mainly in the defense of democracy and the independence of peoples. It would be to betray what is most sacred to the nations, the dead fallen in righteous combat for an ideal—and here I call to mind the military cemeteries in Europe, and among them the Campo Santo of Pistoia, where the Brazilian soldiers are laid in eternal rest—it would be to forget the fateful hours not to defend the freedom of man, not to defend democratic government whenever it is threatened.

The Brazilian Nation rejects all forms of tyranny as you, too, reject them; tyranny and oppression, whether from right or left, are equally repulsive to us. We Brazilians are steadfast and determined to safeguard the fruits of our liberty that we strove so hard to win.

The Brazilian Nation holds the freedom of her sons as dear as does the American Nation; the Brazilian Nation cherishes and stands guard over her moral and spiritual heritage and needs none to give her lessons in self-respect—herein again

we are alike. We are, however, well aware that successful opposition to extremist ideologies that infringe on the prerogatives of man lies not so much in ruthless repression as in finding a solution to the grave problems of development and prosperity. We know that ideas of oppression must be routed by constructive action and that there is no more efficient remedy for curing the antidemocratic sickness than the contentment and satisfaction of the patient. To combat extremist ideas in my country—ideas now defended by but a small minority—it is chiefly necessary to bring Brazil into line with her destiny, to work constantly toward a higher standard of living as you have done in this country. Brazilians do not believe that the social problem can be efficiently coped with except by way of development, expansion, progress, an improvement in the living conditions of the population, and naturally by the spread of culture along humanistic lines and by deepening the notion of moral law.

I feel that I have now said enough, gentlemen of this high chamber which is the Senate of the United States of America, for you to recognize the intentions and desires of cooperation and understanding, the design for social progress, and the political line of thought which characterize the future Government of Brazil with regard to your country. I have already outlined the constructive and pioneering zeal which will be the mainspring of my government. In a few parting words, I should like to convey once again the depth of my sentiments and to stress that your material greatness would not be really great, had it not been made available for the furtherance of great and noble causes, notably the defense of man, his freedom, and his well-being on this complex planet of ours on which God has seen fit to place us.

EXCERPT FROM JANUARY 6 ADDRESS

With you I intend to discuss frankly three points which are important for a proper understanding of my policy, the policy of the coming administration of Brazil. These three subjects are also of constant interest to Brazilian journalists.

First, freedom of the press; secondly, my attitude toward extremisms, whether from the right

or from the left; and thirdly, my point of view with regard to foreign capital in Brazil.

I am in a good position to come out squarely in favor of absolute freedom of the press. I have been the target of unfair campaigns, but I have learned a great deal from them. I know from my own experience that defamation cannot stand up against the truth, just as I know that nothing is more useful to a government than the criticism that is leveled at it, whatever form such criticism may take. He who would wield political power must be on his guard against many hidden dangers, but the greatest of them all is the formation of a sort of cloud of unreality that surrounds the executive and obscures his judgment. The press and other forms of free expression of opinion have the power to awaken perceptions and focus attention, and, when a campaign is unjust, this in itself has the merit of arousing in those who hold the power the instinct of self-defense, which is also indispensable to the health of a democratic regime.

Freedom of the press is, however, no longer a problem in my country. It would not enter into anyone's head—save in times of upheaval and peril—to argue about whether the press should be free or not. In Brazil we are all convinced that a press that is not free is quite unworthy of the name. Any debate on this question is purely academic.

I am well aware that the problem of communism is one of your most constant sources of worry. For communism to get the upper hand in Brazil, it would be necessary for there to be a complete change of heart, a transformation in the fundamental character of the Brazilian people, or for the problems of the people to be allowed to drag on without any attempt being made to solve them. Brazil is a nation in which Christian faith and upbringing is predominant. My country was called Vera Cruz (the True Cross) and Santa Cruz (the Holy Cross), before it received its present name. Succeeding generations grew up in the shadow of the Cross and gradually the national character took definitive shape. It would be extremely difficult to remold our country into a stronghold of materialism.

We want no extremist ideology to dominate our land. But we realize that police repression is no way of changing a man's opinions, nor does it make for enlightenment of the people. The way to defeat the ideas of leftist totalitarianism is to pay heed to the appeals of the underprivileged, to strive to raise the standard of living of the working classes, and to combat poverty wherever it may be encountered. This calls for determination, persistence, and good techniques.

I shall be doing my duty as a Christian and a statesman in endeavoring to meet the revindications of the Brazilian people and pursuing a progressive, humanitarian policy, not of sheer violence but of constructive action to offset the subversive activities of those who seek to warp Brazil from her traditions, her way of living, her religion, and her concept of family ties.

There is no denying that the best way to eradicate communism is to promote prosperity. The remedy is not applicable merely to old and illustrious nations. It will work with any people. We are reluctant to resort to violence in any form in the conflict of ideas, but we like to be firm.

As to foreign capital, my Government will welcome it gladly, as it deserves. The contribution of foreign capital, as well as technical know-how, will prove to be a decisive factor in speeding up our development. Whoever considers the assistance of foreign capital indispensable and is anxious to attract it must start by creating an atmosphere of calm and security and provide suitable guaranties if investments are to materialize. This is what my Government will try to do, and we shall make a point of it, not merely because therein lie our interests but for ethical reasons. To appeal to foreign capital for strengthening and developing the country, and afterward to persecute such capital, is a procedure which only can be qualified as entrapment.

A careful analysis shows that Brazil has generously rewarded the capital invested in her development. We need the cooperation of foreign capital and we value its aid. Investment will be welcomed, then, but let it come as true investment, not as sheer speculation.

Approval of Recommendations for Controlling Levels of Lake Ontario

Press release 686 dated December 9

The following exchange of correspondence has taken place between the Department of State and the U.S. Section of the International Joint Commission, U.S.-Canada, with reference to the control of the levels of Lake Ontario in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and power projects.¹ In these letters the chairman of the U.S. Section of the Commission has recommended that a specific range of elevations be established for the lake, that certain criteria be adopted as a basis for its regulation, and that a specific plan of regulation which was developed within this range of elevations and according to these criteria be approved by the Government of the United States.

The Department of State, as the coordinating authority for the Government, has accepted the Commission's recommendations with regard to the range of elevations and criteria. It also has approved the plan of regulation as a basis for channel excavations in connection with the St. Lawrence projects, at the same time urging the Commission to continue its studies in order "to perfect the plan of regulation so as best to meet the requirements of all interests both upstream and downstream," within the approved range of elevations and criteria.

LETTER FROM INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE, MARCH 17, 1955

The Honorable

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In accordance with the

¹ Similar letters were exchanged on the same dates by the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission.

intention expressed in the letters which it addressed on 23 February 1955 to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada respectively,² the International Joint Commission met in Montreal on 14, 15 and 16 March 1955.³ The meeting was held to enable the Commission to reach tentative conclusions as to the range of stage of Lake Ontario which, on technical considerations, would be most appropriate in accordance with the purposes of the Lake Ontario Reference dated 25 June 1952⁴ submitted to the Commission by both Governments under the provisions of Article IX of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909.⁵

At the meeting in Montreal, the Commission received technical information and advice from the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers. It also had the benefit of the advice and views of the International St. Lawrence River Board of Control, the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers and Counsel for the Governments of the United States and Canada.

Written representations were received from lakeshore property owners and municipalities and from the St. Lawrence power and seaway agencies of both countries.

As a result of its deliberations, the Commission is satisfied that measures can be taken, having due regard to the interests of all concerned, to regulate the level of Lake Ontario for the benefit of property owners on the shores of the lake in both countries, so as to reduce the extremes of stage which have been experienced in the past.

It is the Commission's tentative conclusion that the works for the development of power in the

² Not printed.

³ For text of joint statement issued on Mar. 16, see BULLETIN of Apr. 4, 1955, p. 563.

⁴ Department of State press release 489 dated June 24, 1952.

⁵ 36 Stat. 2448; for text, see S. Doc. 165, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 104.

International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River, which were approved by the Commission in its Order of Approval dated 29 October 1952,⁶ should be operated in accordance with the criteria set forth below. These criteria are consistent with the basic, governing requirements of paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of that Order of Approval. The elevations indicated in the criteria are referred to the Oswego gage and are based on the principal gages on Lake Ontario, adjusted to the Oswego gage, United States Lake Survey 1935 datum. As soon as a method of regulation, based on these criteria, has been worked out in detail and approved, the Commission proposes to substitute it for Method of Regulation No. 5 mentioned in paragraph (i) and in paragraph (a) of Appendix A of that Order of Approval.

Proposed Criteria for a Method of Regulation of Outflows and Levels of Lake Ontario Applicable to the Works in the International Rapids Section of the Saint Lawrence River

(a) The regulated outflow from Lake Ontario from 1 April to 15 December shall be such as not to reduce the minimum level of Montreal Harbor below that which would have occurred in the past with the supplies to Lake Ontario since 1860 adjusted to a condition assuming a continuous diversion out of the Great Lakes Basin of 3,100 cubic feet per second at Chicago and a continuous diversion into the Great Lakes Basin of 5,000 c. f. s. from the Albany River Basin (hereinafter called the "supplies of the past as adjusted").⁷

(b) The regulated winter outflows from Lake Ontario from 15 December to 31 March shall be as large as feasible and shall be maintained so that the difficulties of winter power operation are minimized.

(c) The regulated outflow from Lake Ontario during the annual spring break-up in Montreal Harbor and in the river downstream shall not be greater than would have occurred assuming supplies of the past as adjusted.

(d) The regulated outflow from Lake Ontario during the annual flood discharge from the Ottawa River shall not be greater than would have occurred assuming supplies of the past as adjusted.

(e) Consistent with other requirements, the minimum regulated monthly outflow from Lake Ontario shall be such as to secure the maximum dependable flow for power.

(f) Consistent with other requirements, the maximum regulated outflow from Lake Ontario shall be maintained as low as possible to reduce channel excavations to a minimum.

⁶ BULLETIN of Dec. 29, 1952, p. 1019.

⁷ For an exchange of notes between the United States and Canada on the diversion of waters into the Great Lakes system, see *ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1940, p. 430.

(g) Consistent with other requirements, the levels of Lake Ontario shall be regulated for the benefit of property owners on the shores of Lake Ontario in the United States and Canada so as to reduce the extremes of stage which have been experienced.

(h) The regulated monthly mean level of Lake Ontario shall not exceed elevation 248.0 with the supplies of the past as adjusted.

(i) Under regulation, the frequencies of occurrences of monthly mean elevations of approximately 247.0 and higher on Lake Ontario shall be less than would have occurred in the past with the supplies of the past as adjusted and with present channel conditions in the Galops Rapids Section of the Saint Lawrence River.

(j) The regulated level of Lake Ontario on 1 April shall not be lower than elevation 244.0. The regulated monthly mean level of the lake from 1 April to 30 November shall be maintained at or above elevation 244.0.

(k) In the event of supplies in excess of the supplies of the past as adjusted, the works in the International Rapids Section shall be operated to provide all possible relief to the riparian owners upstream and downstream. In the event of supplies less than the supplies of the past as adjusted, the works in the International Rapids Section shall be operated to provide all possible relief to navigation and power interests.

The Commission will hold public hearings at Rochester, New York, and Toronto, Ontario, on 12 and 14 April 1955 respectively, at which all interested parties, including the property owners on the shores of Lake Ontario and the Saint Lawrence River, both upstream and downstream from the works in the International Rapids Section, will be given full opportunity to present their views upon the range of stage and the other criteria tentatively proposed.

After consideration of the views of all concerned, and as soon as possible after these public hearings, the Commission will present an interim report recommending, for the approval of the two Governments, a range of lake levels and criteria for acceptable duration of high stages of Lake Ontario.

If the two Governments approve the recommendations which will be contained in the interim report, the Commission will put the recommendations into effect by issuing an appropriate supplement to its Order of Approval, dated 29 October 1952. The Commission hopes to be able to issue this supplement on or about 1 May 1955.

Yours sincerely,

LEN JORDAN
Chairman
United States Section

Department of State Bulletin

LETTER FROM INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE, MAY 9, 1955

The Honorable

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In my letter of March 17, 1955, I transmitted to you on behalf of the Commission, criteria for a plan of regulation of Lake Ontario in connection with the St. Lawrence Power Project, having regard to all interests affected. In that letter, I also informed you that after public hearings and a consideration of the views of all concerned, the Commission would present an interim report recommending, for the approval of the two Governments, a range of lake levels and criteria for acceptable duration of high stages of Lake Ontario.

Public hearings were held at Rochester, New York, and at Toronto, Ontario, on April 12 and 14. The Commission considered this matter fully at an executive session in Buffalo, New York, on May 5, 1955.

As a result of these deliberations the Commission has reached agreement on a range of elevations, 244 (navigation season) to 248.0 feet as nearly as may be. Further, a plan of regulation (No. 12-A-9) has been developed within this range and three copies of it are enclosed.^a This plan, subject to minor adjustments that may result from further detailed study and evaluation, seems to offer the best possibility of achieving the optimum objective set forth in the Reference.

The Commission accordingly recommends to the Governments the adoption of the criteria, range of elevations and plan of regulation mentioned above. If the Governments concur in this recommendation the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power entities should be advised that they may proceed with the determination of the critical profiles and the final design of channel excavations based on this range and plan of regulations 12-A-9, with the assurance that any adjustments required will be of a minor nature.

Taking into account the downstream interests and on the basis of the past 95 years' experience, the recommended method of regulation will lower

all stages in Lake Ontario above elevation 246 and thus provide substantial benefits to the lakeshore owners.

Sincerely yours,

LEN JORDAN
*Chairman
United States Section*

LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, DECEMBER 3, 1955

The Honorable

LEN JORDAN,
*Chairman, United States Section,
International Joint Commission.*

DEAR MR. JORDAN: I have for reply your letter of May 9, 1955, on the subject of Lake Ontario levels. I note that the International Joint Commission has reached agreement and has recommended a range of elevations for Lake Ontario, namely, 244 feet (navigation season) to 248 feet, as nearly as may be. I am pleased to inform you that this range of mean monthly elevations is approved by the Government of the United States.

In your letter of May 9, you also stated that the Commission recommended approval of the criteria for the operation of the regulatory works being built in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River, set out in your letter of March 17, 1955. I am pleased to inform you that the Government of the United States approves these criteria as recommended in your letter of May 9.

Copies of Plan of Regulation No. 12-A-9, which had been developed within this range of elevations and according to these criteria, were enclosed with your letter of May 9. It is apparent that the Plan of Regulation will be modified in minor details from time to time, both during the construction stage and afterwards as the several works are completed and come into operation. Accordingly, it is important to preserve the flexibility for adjustments and progressive improvements which, subject to specified requirements and procedure, is prescribed in paragraph (i) of the Commission's order of approval of October 29, 1952. It is important that the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers and the Power and Seaway entities be provided with a Plan of Regulation in substitution for Plan of Regulation No. 5 referred to in the order of approval, as the basis on which they may

^a Not printed.

proceed with the determination of the critical profiles and the design for channel excavations, if the whole St. Lawrence project is not to be delayed seriously. Therefore, the Government of the United States approves Plan of Regulation No. 12-A-9 for the purpose of calculating critical profiles and the design of channel excavations.

The Government urges the Commission to continue its studies with a view to perfecting the Plan of Regulation so as best to meet the requirements of all interests both upstream and downstream, within the range of elevations and criteria herein approved.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.
Under Secretary

U.S.-Canadian Commission Discusses Levels of Lake Ontario

IJC press release dated December 21

In the course of a special meeting held on 19 and 20 December in New York City, the International Joint Commission considered the terms of the supplement to its Order of Approval of 29 October 1952,¹ which it is planning to issue with respect to the regulatory works in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River.

As the Commission has received letters of 3 December 1955,² approving the recommendations regarding the levels of Lake Ontario, discussions were held with the technical advisers regarding the terms of such an order.

The proposed supplement to the Order of Approval will put into effect the approval of the Governments of the United States and Canada of the Commission's recommendations regarding the range of stage and criteria for operation of the works.

The Commission has reexamined the provisions for protection and indemnity which are provided by the St. Lawrence Order of Approval. In the order of the 29th of October 1952, the Commission stated that as a condition of its approval it had required that: "All interests on either side of the International Boundary which are injured by reason of the construc-

tion, maintenance and operation of the works shall be given suitable and adequate protection and indemnity in accordance with the laws in Canada or the Constitution and laws in the United States respectively, and in accordance with the requirements of Article VIII of the Treaty" (the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909). The Commission provided that under such order it retain jurisdiction over the subject matter and may "after giving such notice and opportunity to all interested parties to make representations as the Commission deems appropriate, make such further Order or Orders relating thereto as may be necessary in the judgment of the Commission."

Attention was invited to the fact that during the construction of the works and after the project is in operation, persons who may feel aggrieved because of anything that is done may bring their problems or complaints to the entities (The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario or the Power Authority of the State of New York), the Provincial, State, or Federal Governments, or the Commission for whatever remedial measures may be appropriate in the circumstances.

United States and Germany Discuss Research Reactor Agreement

Press release 10 dated January 6

JOINT ANNOUNCEMENT

Discussions were initiated today by the German Embassy and representatives of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to an agreement for cooperation in the field of research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The United States has negotiated 24 of these agreements, which provide the basis for cooperation in the training of personnel in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, look to the installation of research reactors, and provide the legal framework necessary for the lease or sale of a limited amount of fissionable material. They also provide for the exchange of unclassified information in the research reactor field, related health and safety problems, and on the use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry. It is expected that a research reactor

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 29, 1952, p. 1019.

² See above.

agreement with the German Federal Republic will assist the Federal Republic in meeting the problem of training personnel in the various fields of nuclear science.

Negotiations Concerning Debts of City of Berlin

Press release 8 dated January 5

Agreement has now been reached that negotiations are considered to be practicable for the settlement of debts owed by the city of Berlin and by public utility enterprises owned or controlled by Berlin. This agreement is in accordance with article 5 (5) of the Agreement on German External Debts of February 27, 1953.¹

The agreement was concluded by similar exchanges of notes between the United States, British, and French Embassies at Bonn, Germany, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany. The texts of the notes exchanged between the U.S. Embassy and the Foreign Ministry follow.

The dollar bonds, the settlement of which was deferred under article 5 (5) of the Agreement on German External Debts, are as follows:

City of Berlin 6 percent of 1928 due June 15, 1958
City of Berlin 6½ percent of 1925 due April 1, 1950
Berlin City Electric Company 6 percent of 1930 due April 1, 1955
Berlin City Electric Company 6½ percent of 1926 due December 1, 1951
Berlin City Electric Company 6½ percent of 1929 due February 1, 1959
Berlin Electric Elevated and Underground Railways 6½ percent due October 1, 1956

Holders of bonds of the above issues that have not been validated should register them with the Validation Board for German Dollar Bonds, 30 Broad Street, New York 4, New York, before February 29, 1956, in order that they may be eligible for settlement under the terms of any settlement offer that may be announced as a result of the forthcoming negotiations.

Inquiries regarding the settlement of the bonds of the city of Berlin should be directed to the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, Incorporated, 90 Broad Street, New York 4, New York. Inquiries regarding the other issues should be directed to the U.S. Committee for German Corpo-

rate Dollar Bonds, 910 17th Street, Northwest, Washington 6, D.C.

The provisions of article 5 (5) of the Agreement on German External Debts are as follows:

The settlement of debts owed by the City of Berlin and by public utility enterprises owned or controlled by Berlin, and situated in Berlin, shall be deferred until such time as negotiations on the settlement of these debts are considered by the Governments of the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America and by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Senat of Berlin to be practicable.

Note From German Foreign Ministry

The German Foreign Office has the honor to communicate the following to the Embassy of the United States of America concerning the settlement of the debts of the City of Berlin and of the Berlin public utility enterprises mentioned in para 5 of Article 5 of the Agreement on German External Debts of February 27, 1953:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Senat of Berlin consider that the time has arrived to enter into negotiations on the settlement of the above-mentioned debts.

The German Foreign Office would, therefore, appreciate being notified by the Government of the United States of America whether it likewise considers such negotiations to be practicable at the present time.

Notes Verbale of the same tenor have been addressed to the Royal British Embassy and the French Embassy.

The German Foreign Office avails itself of this opportunity to assure the Embassy of the United States of America of its highest consideration.

Text of U.S. Reply

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs and has the honor to refer to its note number 507-519-746-71284/55 of the 13th of August, 1955, on the subject of the settlement of the debts of the City of Berlin and of the Berlin public utility enterprises.

In accordance with Article 5 (5) of the Agreement on German External Debts of February 27, 1953, the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs states that the Government of the Federal Republic and the Senat of Berlin consider that the moment has come to engage in negotiations for the settlement of these debts.

¹ S. Exec. D, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

The Government of the United States of America also considers that negotiations for the settlement of these debts are now practicable.

The Embassy of the United States of America assumes that the Senat of Berlin will send separately to the Allied Kommandatura a formal statement that it shares the same view.

The Embassy of the United States of America suggests that, upon receipt by the Allied Kommandatura of the note of the Berlin Senat, certified true copies of the notes originated by the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the British Embassy, the French Embassy, the Embassy of the United States of America should be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland for transmission to governments which are signatories of or which accede to the Agreement on German External Debts.

The Embassy of the United States of America avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs the assurance of its highest consideration.

U.S. Asks Payment of Damages for Destruction of Navy Plane

Press release 11 dated January 6

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Department of State on January 6 delivered to the Soviet Embassy at Washington a note requesting the payment of \$724,947.68 as damages for the destruction of a Navy Neptune and injuries to the crew members resulting from an attack by Soviet fighter aircraft over the Bering Sea near St. Lawrence Island. As the note states, the total damages suffered were \$1,449,895.36. The United States Government, however, agreed on July 7, 1955, to accept a Soviet offer to pay 50 percent of the amount of the damages inflicted.¹

The note makes clear that the Soviet attack upon the Neptune was unprovoked and that it took place while the Neptune was flying lawfully in the international air space over the Bering Sea. It reiterates that the United States' acceptance of 50 percent of the damages caused by the wrongful act of the Soviet military aircraft is not to be construed as in any way condoning

¹ BULLETIN of July 18, 1955, p. 100.

the illegality of the Soviet conduct but that it is motivated, as was stated in the note of July 7, 1955, by the Soviet Government's expression of regret and its statement that orders have been issued to military authorities to refrain from any future action of this character.

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE OF JANUARY 6

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer again to the incident of June 22, 1955, in which Soviet military jet-propelled aircraft shot down and destroyed a United States naval Neptune aircraft lawfully flying near St. Lawrence Island over the Bering Sea, and caused serious injuries to the crew of the naval aircraft. In a memorandum delivered by the Foreign Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Vyacheslav M. Molotov, to the Secretary of State of the United States at San Francisco on June 25, 1955, the Soviet Government expressed its regret in regard to the incident and offered to bear fifty percent of the amount of the damages inflicted. On July 7, 1955, the United States Government in a note to the Soviet Government stated, among other things, that it was prepared to regard the Soviet memorandum of June 25, 1955, on this subject, as providing an acceptable basis for the disposal of this particular incident.

In acknowledging the note of July 7, 1955, the Soviet Government, in a note of July 18, 1955, delivered to the Department of State by the Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, stated that "investigation has confirmed the facts communicated June 25, 1955 . . . concerning the violation of the Soviet state frontier by a military airplane of the 'Neptune' type. . . ."

The United States Government, in the interest of preventing the reoccurrence of similar incidents in the future, which the Soviet Government states it also desires to prevent, finds it necessary to take this opportunity to point out with regret that the Soviet Government's latest note suggests the implication that the Soviet Government adheres to a version of the facts directly opposite to those found by the United States with respect to this incident. In particular, while it does not state precisely where the Soviet state frontier is claimed

by the Soviet Government to lie in this area, or precisely where in geographical coordinates the violation of a Soviet state frontier by the Neptune aircraft on June 22, 1955 (June 23 Moscow Time) is claimed to have taken place, it reiterates that such a violation in fact took place. This reiteration is a cause of concern.

For its part the United States Government has made a careful investigation of the entire incident as well as of the damages inflicted upon the United States and upon United States nationals involved in consequence of the attack by the Soviet aircraft under reference. This has disclosed that the Neptune aircraft was attacked without warning by Soviet fighter aircraft, believed to be of the MIG-jet type, at approximately 2213 hours Greenwich Mean Time, in the neighborhood of St. Lawrence Island, at a position not closer than twenty-four nautical miles to the nearest Soviet land mass and probably as far as fifty-three nautical miles from such a land mass. Furthermore, at no time in the course of its flight in this area had the Neptune aircraft approached any closer to any Soviet-held land mass. The attack by the Soviet aircraft caused crew members inside the Neptune to be hit by shell fragments and projectiles; the aircraft suffered a fire in the port wing and multiple hits in the fuselage and starboard wing and was forced to crash on the beach of St. Lawrence Island, eight miles south of Gambell. During the crash landing, as a result of the injuries caused by the attack, an explosion took place on board the aircraft. The fire and the explosion caused additional serious injuries to members of the crew. All crew members suffered shock. The aircraft and its contents became a total wreck.

The Soviet Government has not controverted the United States Government's factual statements as to the geographical position of attack by the Soviet fighters. The United States Government is therefore at a loss to understand the basis of fact upon which the Soviet Government proceeds in its averment that the Neptune violated a Soviet state frontier. It does not understand the Soviet Government to challenge, by implication or otherwise, that the positions described by the United States Government in this area as those of the flight of the Neptune and of the attack upon it by Soviet fighters were beyond question in the universally accepted and long-established

international air space of the Bering Sea area.

The United States Government is therefore reinforced in its conclusions with respect to this incident. First, the attack in this case by Soviet aircraft was entirely unprovoked. Secondly, the attack took place while the Neptune was flying lawfully in the international air space of the Bering Sea area between St. Lawrence Island and the coast of Siberia.

In agreeing to accept from the Soviet Government only one-half of the damages caused by the wrongful act of the Soviet military aircraft involved in this incident, the United States Government desires to make it clear that it is not condoning the illegality of the Soviet conduct, or impugning the legality and innocence of the acts of the Neptune and its crew, but acting because of the special circumstances surrounding the incident to which reference is made in the note of July 7, 1955.

The United States Government has found after careful investigation that the damages inflicted upon the United States and its nationals in consequence of the incident total \$1,449,895.36. A detailed breakdown of this figure is set forth in the annex to the present note.

The United States Government requests the Soviet Government, in pursuance of the terms of the agreement represented by the exchange of the memorandum of June 25, 1955, the note of July 7, 1955 and the note of July 18, 1955, to make payment of fifty percent of the above total damages, namely, \$724,947.68. The United States Government requests that payment be made in United States dollar exchange in the form of a dollar check to the order of the Secretary of State of the United States.

Department of State,

Washington, January 6, 1956

[Enclosure]

ANNEX

The figure of \$1,449,895.36 constituting the damages suffered by the United States Government on account of the incident of June 22, 1955 is calculated as follows:

A. Injuries suffered by the United States Government directly:

1. Loss of the United States Navy P2V-5 aircraft, known as Neptune type, bearing number 131515, valued at \$924,700.00

2. Equipment within the aircraft, property of the United States Government, valued at \$95,645.00
3. Cost of search and rescue operations, \$3,000.00
4. Expenditures and loss in consequence of injuries to the crew members and their disablement, \$335,674.71.

B. Injuries suffered by the crew members, all nationals of the United States, not otherwise compensated:

1. Personal injuries, \$90,000.00
2. Personal property on board the aircraft and lost in consequence of the incident, \$875.65.

SOVIET NOTE OF JULY 18

[Translation]

In connection with the note of the Government of the United States of America dated July 7, 1955, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to communicate that a further investigation has confirmed the facts communicated June 25 in V. M. Molotov's statement to Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States of America, concerning the violation of the Soviet state frontier by a military airplane of the "Neptune" type with the identification marks of the United States Air Force.

The Soviet Government takes note of the statement of the Government of the United States to the effect that it is prepared to consider the statement of the Soviet side of June 25 as giving an acceptable basis for the settlement of the incident with the aforementioned American airplane.

The Soviet Government expresses its confidence that, just as is being done by the Soviet side, measures will be taken on the part of the Government of the United States directed toward the prevention of such actions as could lead to incidents similar to the incident of June 23.

The Soviet Government notes with satisfaction the statement contained in the note of the Government of the United States of America to the effect that the Government of the United States of America wishes an improvement in relations between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R., which corresponds fully to the desires of the Soviet Government.

Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Washington

July 18, 1955

Advisers to U.S. Delegation to Tariff Negotiations

The Department of State announced on January 4 (press release 6) that four prominent citizens have accepted the invitation of Secretary

Dulles to serve as advisers to the U.S. delegation in the multilateral tariff negotiations which will begin at Geneva, Switzerland, on January 18.¹

The four advisers will be:

Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of *Business Week* and chairman of the Executive Committee of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives

Bryant Essick, president of the Essick Manufacturing Company, Los Angeles, Calif.

Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of the Department of Research, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)

They began their service on January 4 by conferring with Secretary Dulles and with Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Later they were to be thoroughly briefed on the tariff negotiations by officials of the White House and various executive agencies participating in the trade agreements program. They will then go to Geneva to observe the bargaining sessions at first hand and to take part in the United States delegation's deliberations.

The United States will negotiate with 24 other countries with a view toward reciprocal tariff concessions. These countries, like the United States, are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The United States will participate under the authority in Public Law 86, the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1955 (known as H.R. 1 before its enactment last June 21). In this act Congress authorized the President to reduce tariff rates by not over 15 percent or, if a rate now is above 50 percent, to lower it to that level. In either case the reduction will take place gradually over a 3-year period.

The U.S. delegation may offer concessions only on products drawn from a selected list which has been publicly announced and made the subject of public hearings.

The delegation will consist of officials from the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, Treasury, Interior, and Labor; the Tariff Commission; and the International Cooperation Administration. The list of delegates will be published shortly.

¹ For earlier announcements, see BULLETIN of Aug. 22, 1955, p. 305, and Sept. 20, 1955, p. 507.

Summary of Accomplishments of Tenth General Assembly

U.S. delegation press release 2332-A dated December 16

Disarmament

By an historic vote of 56-7 the General Assembly endorsed President Eisenhower's "open sky" proposal.¹ The Assembly thus recognized the soundness of the United States approach to the disarmament question.

Speaking to the plenary session of the General Assembly on December 16, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., said:

... Nothing anyone here has ever done, or may do, is likely to work so powerfully for peace as what we have just done here today in giving worldwide endorsement to President Eisenhower's "open sky" plan, which is linked with Marshal Bulganin's plan for ground control posts . . .

By our action today, we have shown that the United Nations can move ahead with the times . . .

... In and of itself, it alone justifies our existence and that of the United Nations.

Membership

On December 13, 15 Soviet vetoes in the Security Council—cast in reprisal for the Chinese veto of Outer Mongolia—prevented admission of any of the 13 free-world applicants which the Soviet Union had insisted on tying to its 5 Communist candidates in a "package deal."² Following this action, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative, said in the Security Council:

It was perfectly clear that we today could have had 17 nations admitted to the United Nations if it had not been for the Soviet Union . . . But the Soviet representative insisted on having all or nothing.

... if there is never to be any spirit of compromise, any spirit of accommodation, any give and take, you cannot operate the United Nations . . .

The next day, December 14, 12 free nations be-

came members of the United Nations when the Soviet Union retreated from its "18 or nothing" stand. The Soviet representative then vetoed a U.S. resolution calling for Japan's admission in 1956—which received 10 votes in favor from the other Council members.

Thus the United Nations received the added vitality of 12 long-excluded free countries. The Soviet retreat showed that even an apparently inflexible Soviet stand will be scrapped in the face of adverse circumstances and the pressure of world opinion.

Atoms-for-Peace

The atoms-for-peace program, launched by President Eisenhower in his United Nations address of December 1953, received new impetus. By a vote of 58 to 0, the Assembly on December 3 approved a method for establishing the International Atomic Energy Agency and called for a second scientific conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy within 3 years.³

In a speech to the plenary session of the General Assembly on December 3, Senator John O. Pastore, speaking for the United States, said:

Two years ago President Eisenhower presented before this Assembly his memorable proposal for an international agency devoted to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The adoption of this resolution [marks] another milestone in our advance toward the establishment of this agency.

By stimulating the free exchange of basic scientific knowledge on atomic energy, the international conference provided for in . . . this resolution will lay a firmer foundation for international cooperation in this field.

Radiation

On December 3, the Assembly approved unanimously a United States proposal to organize studies of the effects of atomic radiation on man and his environment⁴—thus taking a big step to dispel the ignorance and fears which are widespread in the world on this subject.

¹ For text of resolution and statements by Ambassador Lodge, see BULLETIN of Jan. 9, 1956, pp. 63 and 55.

² For statements and resolutions, see *ibid.*, Dec. 26, 1955, p. 1067.

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 24, 1955, p. 660; Nov. 14, 1955, p. 801; Dec. 19, 1955, p. 1030.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Nov. 21, 1955, p. 851; Dec. 19, 1955, p. 1031.

Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, speaking in the plenary session of the General Assembly on December 3, commented:

The United States attaches the greatest importance to this problem and will of course lend its full support to the Scientific Committee established by this resolution. . . .

We hope that the committee will convene as early as possible next year and will begin quickly to organize its plan of work.

On December 9, 1955, Ambassador Lodge informed the Secretary-General of the appointment of Dr. Shields Warren as U.S. representative on the scientific committee established by this resolution and of the appointment of Dr. Austin Moore Brues and Merrill Eisenbud as alternate U.S. representatives.

Charter Review

The Assembly on November 21 approved a resolution deciding in principle to hold a Charter Review Conference and setting up a mechanism to decide by 1957 where and when that conference should be held as well as its organization and procedures.⁵

Speaking to the plenary session of the General Assembly on November 17, Laird Bell said:

Article 109 directs our attention to *review* rather than to *revision* of the charter. A review of the charter could usefully determine whether or not improvements in the United Nations machinery are desirable and feasible We need, it seems to us, to take time out from the urgencies of specific problems . . . to study, reflect, and consult on the United Nations system as a whole. . . .

. . . It is our belief that a conference to review the charter could greatly strengthen . . . public understanding. We believe, as well, that the weight of informed public opinion based upon such a conference might prove to be a constructive influence in the achievement of agreement to recommended improvements.

Togoland

By a vote of 42-7-10, the Assembly gave its approval to the holding of a plebiscite next spring in British Togoland which could mark British Togoland as the first of the trust territories under United Nations supervision to emerge from that status.⁶ The Assembly's decision, giving the people of British Togoland the right to vote for union with an independent Gold Coast or for remain-

ing temporarily under trusteeship pending similar developments in French Togoland, marks a significant step toward the development of free political institutions among the non-self-governing people of West Africa.

Speaking of this development in the General Assembly's Fourth Committee, Laird Bell said:

One must give credit to the foundations laid by the administering authorities, to the increasingly effective political action of the inhabitants themselves, and, in some measure, to the focusing of world public opinion on these areas through the United Nations.

Palestine Refugees

The General Assembly on December 3 voted 38 to 0 with 17 abstentions to continue the Arab refugee aid program in spite of the political tensions surrounding this situation.⁷

Speaking to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on November 16, Ambassador James J. Wadsworth said:

[The United States] recognize[s] the necessity of settling the political problems connected with the Palestine question. . . . But what must be of paramount importance here, now, in this debate, is that these political problems which must be resolved—and which have taken and will take time to solve—shall not stand in the way of steps of progress toward a better life for the Arab refugee.

International Finance Corporation

The General Assembly expressed again approval of the creation of the International Finance Corporation, a one-hundred-million-dollar corporation, to stimulate private investment in underdeveloped countries.

Speaking in Committee II on October 26, Colgate Whitehead Darden, Jr., said:⁸

The idea of the International Finance Corporation . . . is one of the results of our continuing search in the United Nations for ways to encourage private capital to play an increasing role in economic development around the world. . . .

. . . I am happy to say that my Government has now completed all the necessary legislative steps required for our membership in the corporation. These include authority to contribute over \$35 million to its capital stock.

SUNFED

In a resolution dealing with the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, the General Assembly on December 9 unanimously recognized the need for continued and increased

⁵ *Ibid.*, Dec. 5, 1955, p. 948.

⁶ See p. 100.

⁷ BULLETIN of Jan. 2, 1956, p. 31.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Nov. 21, 1955, p. 858.

economic aid to underdeveloped countries. The resolution recognized that new United Nations efforts in the field of economic development must await the time when governments are able to devote additional funds to this purpose as a result of reductions in arms expenditures resulting from an agreed disarmament plan.

Speaking in Committee II on November 25, Congressman Brooks Hays said:⁹

... it is the view of my Government that under existing circumstances it would be premature to try now to define precisely what should be the organization and operation of the proposed international fund. . . .

... the *ad hoc* committee which is to be constituted under this resolution is to carry on an orderly exploration . . . of the various ideas and suggestions which governments may have relating to the proposed special fund which may be useful when the fund becomes a practical possibility.

Technical Assistance

Every country either equaled or exceeded its contribution last year to the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, putting the program at its highest level thus far.

Speaking in Committee II on October 12, Congressman Brooks Hays announced:¹⁰

... it gives me great pleasure to be able to announce that my Government will pledge to the United Nations Technical Assistance Program for 1956 the sum of \$15,500,000. The only limitation on this contribution is that it shall not exceed 50 percent of all contributions.

Refugees

The Assembly reaffirmed by a vote of 43 to 0 with 15 abstentions on October 25 the humanitarian character of the refugee program in spite of the Soviet effort to turn it into a machine for forced repatriation of Iron Curtain refugees.¹¹

Jacob Blaustein in the plenary session of the General Assembly on October 25 said:

The High Commissioner for Refugees . . . has always followed the principle that the refugee should be left entirely free to choose the solution to his problem, whether it be return to the country of origin, resettlement in another country, or integration in the receiving country. . . .

⁹ U.S. delegation press release 2284 (not printed here).

¹⁰ U.S. delegation press release 2226 (not printed here).

¹¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 17, 1955, p. 628, and Nov. 14, 1955, p. 811.

The draft resolution of the U.S.S.R. . . . was significantly different in approach The resolution would have required the High Commissioner to "urge" the refugees to return. Indeed, in its original form it contained no mention whatever of resettlement or integration, and . . . its revised form included these only as subsequent steps if "encouraged" repatriation failed. This bore strongly in the direction of "forcible" repatriation

Human Rights

Committee III, on November 21, unanimously endorsed a United Nations action program in the field of human rights, in line with President Eisenhower's proposals.¹²

In a statement on November 16, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord said:

The United Nations demonstrated today its sincere interest in achieving greater freedom in all areas of life, for men and women everywhere, by the overwhelming vote in favor of the new program of advisory services in the field of human rights.

... The General Assembly has expressed the hope that international and national nongovernmental organizations, universities, and other private groups will supplement this United Nations program in further research and the exchange of information concerning human rights. Consequently the United Nations program will serve as a catalyst for practical action in many fields—for example, in promoting women's rights, eradicating discrimination against minorities, and encouraging the free flow of information.

Administrative Tribunal

By a vote of 33 to 17 with 9 abstentions, the United States proposal to establish judicial review of decisions of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal was approved by the Assembly on November 8.¹³ This was the culmination of several years of United States efforts to provide for review of the judgements of the Administrative Tribunals.

United States efforts in this direction arose from judgments of the Tribunal in 1952 and 1953 making awards to 11 American employees of the United Nations who were dismissed by the Secretary-General after invoking the Fifth Amendment before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

In a speech on November 8, 1955, before the General Assembly's plenary session, Congressman Chester E. Mellow said:

¹² *Ibid.*, Dec. 19, 1955, p. 1034.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Dec. 5, 1955, p. 938.

... the primary objective of the procedure adopted ... has been to provide a way in which the possible concern of member states with respect to future Administrative Tribunal judgments could be dealt with by judicial process.

International Law Commission

Recommendations of the International Law Commission for facilitating its work and increasing its effectiveness were approved by the Assembly which increased the terms of office for its members and authorized it to hold its meetings in Geneva.

Speaking to the Assembly's Legal Committee on October 10, 1955,¹⁴ Robert L. Brokenburr pointed out that the United States has "been impressed by the range of problems dealt with by the [International Law] Commission, and by the valuable contribution of the Commission's work to the growth of law in the life of the United Nations."

Future Status of Togoland

STATEMENT BY LAIRD BELL¹

The accelerating political advancement of West Africa is one of the striking and gratifying developments of recent years. New African nations are emerging toward independence with much greater speed than would have been anticipated a few years ago. While this development is not without its element of struggle, it is taking place almost entirely in the field of political action and not through force of arms. Many elements have contributed to this essentially peaceful historic process. One must give credit to the foundations laid by the administering authorities, to the increasingly effective political action of the inhabitants themselves, and, in some measure, to the focusing of world public opinion on these areas through the United Nations.

In West Africa, as elsewhere, the solution of old problems brings other problems to the fore. Thus, the welcome advent of Gold Coast independence has focused urgent attention on the

Togoland problem. Moreover, it has thrown the spotlight particularly on British-administered Togoland. That territory, though different in legal status from the Gold Coast, has under the provisions of the mandate and the trusteeship agreement fully shared its political, economic, and social development. One of the questions now before this committee is whether British Togoland shall be given an opportunity to take the final step over the threshold of independence at the same time as the Gold Coast, becoming an integral part of that new state. By the same token, the peoples of British Togoland should have the opportunity of *not* taking that step, thereby leaving themselves free to decide later on their future status.

We have been told by the United Kingdom delegation that Gold Coast independence should be a fact before the end of 1956. Under these circumstances, it is clear that, if the peoples of British Togoland are to be given an opportunity to go ahead with the Gold Coast, a plebiscite must be held in British Togoland next spring.

It has often been emphasized that in the colonial field a sense of timing is particularly important. The administering members are not infrequently advised to be more sensitive to the changing tempo of the times. They must seize the psychological moment to take decisive steps forward. In the Fourth Committee, we are now faced with a problem of timing. In the view of my delegation the psychological moment has now arrived in British Togoland. There has just been a special Visiting Mission to the territory to make recommendations concerning the means of ascertaining the people's wishes. Gold Coast independence is just around the corner. The people of the trust territory believe that they are at last to have an opportunity to decide on their future. They are ready and eager to do so. To keep them in suspense, to allow this matter to drag on would, in our view, be a disservice to them. It would not contribute to the orderly march of progress in the area, nor would it redound to the credit of the United Nations among these people.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, my delegation believes that the time is ripe for decision in British Togoland. Consequently, we oppose the establishment of separate institutions for British Togoland before holding a plebiscite. We are convinced that such a step is unnecessary, impractical, and would, with-

¹⁴ U.S. delegation press release 2223 (not printed here).

¹ Made in Committee IV (Trusteeship) of the General Assembly on Dec. 8 (U.S. delegation press release 2315).

out adequate justification, unduly delay decision where decision can and should be taken.

We recognize that one of the reasons for advocating the preliminary establishment of separate institutions for British Togoland is the desire to assure an absolutely free choice for the people of that territory. No one quarrels with that desire. In our view, however, an effort to establish separate institutions would not achieve the desired result. We have heard very clear statements from representatives of the large majority in northern British Togoland that they would not participate in any such separate institutions. We feel that institutions in which a very large proportion of the people would not be represented would be meaningless as a means of formulating the wishes of the people. Consequently, we must seek other means of assuring that freedom of choice is exercised in British Togoland.

For our part we have full confidence in the administering authority to conduct a fair plebiscite. We are sustained in this confidence by the forthright and frank manner in which it has placed this matter before the General Assembly. At the same time, as the administering authority is an interested party, it was the first to recognize that there should be disinterested supervision and observation of every phase of the plebiscite by the United Nations. My delegation is convinced that the arrangements for such supervision and observation recommended by the Visiting Mission would provide the assurance of full freedom of choice that we all desire. We attach particular importance to the selection of a United Nations plebiscite commissioner of outstanding personal qualities and reputation who will command the respect of all concerned. Moreover, he should be assisted by a sufficient number of U.N. observers and other staff to enable him to supervise the plebiscite effectively at all stages and in all areas. Under such conditions, surely no one would be able to question the fairness of the plebiscite. We do not feel, however, that it would be wise or practical to establish a commission for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, in this debate there has been no disagreement on the fundamental proposition that the future status of British and French Togoland should be determined according to the wishes of the inhabitants of those territories. Differences have arisen as to matters of timing, the phrasing

of the questions to be asked, and the arrangements for consulting the people. These differences derive in large measure from the desire of members of the committee to seek ideal solutions. My delegation is concerned, however, lest our preoccupation with such considerations obscure the actual situation in the Togolands and the practical possibilities that are open to us. We are not suggesting the compromise of basic principles. In fact, we believe there is agreement on basic principles. We do hope, however, that the desire of some to obtain more comprehensive solutions will not prevent the taking of the constructive step we are in a position to take. We hope, too, that members will consider the consequences of not taking it.

The Indian draft resolution,² we feel, covers the essential points of the issue before us. It provides for ascertaining the wishes of the inhabitants of Togoland under British administration now. It also envisages a similar procedure for ascertaining the wishes of the inhabitants of Togoland under French administration as soon as proposed programs of political reform for that territory have been carried out. Thus, it provides for the implementation of the fundamental recommendations contained in the Visiting Mission's report.³ Moreover, it does not, in our opinion, prejudice the opportunity of the inhabitants of both territories to assure that their future status conforms to their own wishes.

It is true that the Indian draft implies that only a single question would be asked in the plebiscite to be held in Togoland under British administration. In our view this question gives to the inhabitants a clear choice on the immediate issue before them. If a majority of them vote against integration with the Gold Coast, the effect would be the same as if the two questions proposed by the Visiting Mission were placed before them. Consequently, we do not feel obliged to press for the inclusion of the second question suggested by the Mission.

We would, however, strongly oppose proposals for the inclusion in the plebiscite of several alternative questions. A plebiscite conducted on such a basis would not only be unrealistic and confusing to the people but might well lead to no definitive conclusions.

¹ U.N. doc. A/C.4/L.428.

² U.N. doc. T/1206 and Add. 1.

The distinguished representative of India [V. K. Krishna Menon] has argued cogently for considering the trust territory as a single unit for plebiscite purposes, whereas the Visiting Mission suggested the division of the territory into four plebiscite units. As the United States representative in the Trusteeship Council has said,⁴

We have tried to see the advantages and disadvantages of both points of view. If differences within the population are not too wide, we would normally prefer to see a decision taken on the basis of a majority of the country as a whole. Or if prevailing differences were evenly distributed throughout the country as a whole, we think the attitude of the majority should also prevail. However, when the differences are quite pronounced as between geographic areas, a special situation arises which we feel at least merits some consideration.

We do not believe, however, that this proposal is vital to the conduct of a satisfactory plebiscite. The first step is to learn the wishes of the people. Certainly when they are known the Assembly and the administering authority will be in a position to take the necessary decisions regarding the future of the territory. Thus, we do not feel it essential to press for the adoption of the Visiting Mission's recommendation on this matter either.

Therefore, while we believe that there are some elements in the Indian draft resolution which might be formulated more satisfactorily, we could support its main features. We also share the analyses and conclusions of the Indian representative in regard to the amendments proposed by the representative of Liberia [Angie Brooks].

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ON TOGOLAND¹

U.N. doc. A/Res/366

THE TOGOLAND UNIFICATION PROBLEM AND THE FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF TOGOLAND UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION

I

THE FUTURE OF TOGOLAND UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 860 (IX), adopted on 14 December 1954, by which the Trusteeship Council was re-

¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 2, 1956, p. 36.

² Submitted by India; adopted, as amended, in Committee IV on Dec. 12 by a vote of 40-5 (Soviet bloc)-8; adopted in plenary on Dec. 15, 42-7-10.

quested to consider the arrangements to be made to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British Administration as to their future, without prejudice to the eventual solution which they might choose, whether it be independence, unification of an independent Togoland under British Administration with an independent Togoland under French Administration, unification with an independent Gold Coast, or some other self-governing or independent status,

Having received the report (A/3046) of the Trusteeship Council transmitting the special report (T/1206 and Add. 1) of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955, the observations (T/1214) of the representative of the United Kingdom, and the official records of the relevant meetings of the Council,

Noting the opinion of the Trusteeship Council that the views expressed in the special report of the Visiting Mission provide in general a useful basis for determining the arrangements to be made in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 860 (IX),

Taking note also of the views expressed orally by the various local political groups before the Fourth Committee during the hearings,

Noting further the statement of the Government of the United Kingdom that the Gold Coast will attain independence in the near future and that, in consequence, it will be impossible thereafter for Togoland under British Administration to be administered as at present,

1. *Accepts* the recommendation of the Visiting Mission contained in its special report that the wishes of the inhabitants of Togoland under British Administration as to their future should be ascertained by plebiscite;

2. *Recommends* that the Administering Authority of Togoland under British Administration, in pursuance of Article 76 b of the Charter of the United Nations, take steps, in consultation with a United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, to organize and conduct without delay, under the supervision of the United Nations, a plebiscite in respect of the Trust Territory in order to ascertain the wishes of the majority of its inhabitants in regard to (a) the union of their Territory with an independent Gold Coast; or (b) separation of Togoland under British Administration from the Gold Coast and its continuance under trusteeship pending the ultimate determination of its political future;

3. *Decides* to appoint a United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner² who shall exercise on behalf of the General Assembly the powers and functions of supervision defined by the Visiting Mission in its special report, and who shall be assisted by observers and staff to be appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with him;

4. *Recommends further* that the plebiscite be organized and conducted on the basis of the arrangements proposed in chapter IV of the special report of the Visiting Mission, subject to such modifications of detail as are agreed upon

² The General Assembly on Dec. 15 confirmed the appointment of Eduardo Espinosa Prieto of Mexico as Plebiscite Commissioner.

between the Administering Authority and the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner, and such additional measures as may be proposed by the Commissioner in order to secure a free and neutral atmosphere for the plebiscite;

5. *Requests* the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner to submit a report on the organization, conduct and results of the plebiscite to the Trusteeship Council for its consideration, and for transmission to the General Assembly at its eleventh session in order that the latter may, in consultation with the Administering Authority, assess the results and determine the further action to be taken on the attainment of independence by the Gold Coast in the light of all the circumstances and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement;

6. *Requests* the Trusteeship Council, in virtue of the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement and the Charter, to continue to exercise its functions either at its regular or special sessions as may be necessary and to take into consideration any matter that may arise, or be referred to it, in respect of the Trust Territory.

II

THE FUTURE OF TOGOLAND UNDER FRENCH ADMINISTRATION

The General Assembly,

Noting, with regard to Togoland under French Administration, the statements made by the Administering Authority, as recorded by the Visiting Mission in its special report (T/1206 and Add. 1), to the effect that that Authority itself, taking into account the views of the Territorial Assembly, contemplates holding in due course consultations with the inhabitants of the Territory to ascertain their wishes in respect of the future of the Territory,

Noting also the statements by the representative of France in both the Fourth Committee and the Trusteeship Council to the effect that his Government supports in principle the proposals made by the Visiting Mission,

Noting also the view expressed by the Visiting Mission that, following the political reforms at present contemplated by the Administering Authority, steps will be taken to ascertain the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory as to their future,

1. *Endorses* the conclusion of the Visiting Mission in respect of Togoland under French Administration that the implementation of the contemplated political reforms will play a helpful role in enabling the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory as to their future to be ascertained at an early date by direct and democratic methods;

2. *Recommends* that this consultation of the population be conducted, as in the case of Togoland under British Administration, under the supervision of the United Nations;

3. *Requests* the Trusteeship Council at its forthcoming regular session to undertake a special study of this matter in consultation with the Administering Authority and to report thereon to the General Assembly, if possible, at its eleventh session.

Israeli Action Against Syria

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
U.S. Representative to the U.N.¹*

Mr. President, I speak early at this meeting to express the shock of the United States Government at the military action last Sunday evening [December 11] which the Government of Israel has announced it undertook on Syrian soil against Syrian forces on the northeastern shores of the Sea of Galilee.

We have not yet received official reports from General Burns² nor from the Syrian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission. We therefore cannot now decide what must be the exact position of the Council on this attack.

The United States Government, however, feels compelled to state that, as we have said so many times in the past, we oppose such acts of military violence. We realize that there may be provocations for such action, and for any provocations, if such there be, there is no excuse.

But regardless of whether or not there are provocations, members of the United Nations have undertaken not to resort to the use of force in the settlement of their disputes. Israel has specifically undertaken not to resort to force. It is greatly to be regretted that Buteiha should now be added to the list of military actions which Israel initiated at Gaza, at Qibya, and at El Hamma.

It seems fitting to recall here the words of the President of the United States as set forth in a statement he issued on November 9 as follows:

All Americans have been following with deep concern the latest developments in the Near East. The recent outbreak of hostilities has led to a sharp increase in tensions. These events inevitably retard our search for world peace. Insecurity in one region is bound to affect the world as a whole. . . .

I stated last year that our goal in the Near East as elsewhere is a just peace. Nothing has taken place since which invalidates our fundamental policies, policies based on friendship for all of the peoples of the area.

We believe that true security must be based upon a just and reasonable settlement. . . .

Recent developments have made it all the more imperative that a settlement be found. . . .

¹ Made in the Security Council on Dec. 16 (U.S. U.N. press release 2331).

² Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization.

The peace and future welfare of the Near East rests in largest measure on the shoulders of the leaders of the countries in that part of the world. There must be restraint, regardless of whatever the provocations to fight may be. Should fighting break out again, the only victors will be those who live and rule by misery and chaos. The United States Government is convinced that the responsible leaders in the Near East know this to be true. This Council should encourage as best it can this continued sense of responsibility.

In conclusion let me repeat here what the United States has already said to the Government of Syria: that we extend our sincerest sympathy for this tragic loss of life.

I hope that the President of the Council will see fit to request an urgent report from General Burns detailing all elements of the military action, together with a text of the Mixed Armistice Commission's decision, and setting forth the present situation with regard to the control and policing of the demilitarized zones. We suggest that General Burns be requested to make specific recommendations which may serve as a basis for the further deliberations of the Council when next we meet on this question. I reserve the right to speak again at a later date after we have received the report of the Truce Supervision Organization.³

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Trusteeship Council

United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1954. Report on Ruanda-Urundi together with related documents. T/1168, March 1954. 64 pp. printed.

Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories. The Legislation on Land Tenure, Forests and Mines in the French Trust Territories. T/Ac.36/L.59, October 12, 1955. 8 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955. Special Report on the Togoland Unification Problem and on the Future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British Administration. T/1206, October 18, 1955. 92 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Togoland under British Administration and Togoland under French Administration, 1955. Addendum to the Special Report on the Togoland Unification Problem and the Future of Togoland under British Administration. T/1206/Add. 1, October 21, 1955. 59 pp. mimeo.

³ General Burns' report was circulated on Dec. 20 as U.N. doc. S/3516.

TREATY INFORMATION

Agreement With Germany on Defense Use of Technology

Press release 5 dated January 4

The Department of State announced on January 4 the signing of an agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany to facilitate the exchange of patent rights and technical information for defense purposes. The agreement was signed at Bonn on that date by Heinrich von Brentano, German Foreign Minister, and U.S. Ambassador James B. Conant.

The agreement is expected to foster the exchange of technology for defense purposes between the two Governments and between the private industries of the respective contracting countries. Thus it should prove of reciprocal benefit in providing for national defense and in contributing to the mutual defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area.

The agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany is the latest to be signed to date of a series being negotiated with the NATO countries and with Japan. Other agreements of this nature have been signed with Italy, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Norway, the Netherlands, and Greece.

The agreements recognize that privately owned technology should, to the greatest extent practicable, be exchanged through commercial agreements between owners and users. They also stipulate that rights of private owners of patents and technical information should be fully recognized and protected in accordance with laws applicable to such rights. Other provisions are intended to assure fair treatment of private owners when they deal directly with a foreign government and in cases in which private information communicated through government channels might be used or disclosed without authorization. The agreements also provide for the establishment of arrangements by which owners of patentable inventions placed under secrecy by one government may obtain comparable protection in the other country.

The agreements also provide as a general rule that government-owned inventions shall be interchanged for defense purposes on a royalty-free basis.

Each of the agreements provides for the establishment of a Technical Property Committee to be composed of a representative of each government. These committees are charged with general responsibility for considering and making recommendations on any matters relating to the agreements brought before them by either government, either on their own behalf or on behalf of their nationals. One of the specific functions of the committee is to make recommendations to the governments, either in particular cases or in general, concerning disparities in their laws affecting the compensation of owners of patents and technical information.

The U.S. representative to the Technical Property Committees in Europe is assigned to the staff of the Defense Adviser, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations (Usro), 2 Rue St. Florentin, Paris.

Policy guidance for the U.S. representatives on the Technical Property Committees is provided by the Interagency Technical Property Committee for Defense, which is chaired by the Department of Defense and includes representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Government Patents Board. This committee is assisted by an industry advisory group representing major sectors of American industry concerned with defense production.

New International Agreement on North Atlantic Ice Patrol

Press release 7 dated January 4

On January 4 Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, signed for the U.S. Government a new agreement concerning the contributions of the 11 countries supporting the International Ice Patrol. The new agreement will not affect the operation of the Ice Patrol itself but will bring about a distribution of its cost (\$461,566 for 1955) among participating countries based on the current figures of the tonnage of their merchant shipping benefiting from the services of the patrol. The

present shares are based on out-of-date tonnage figures. Under the new agreement the shares will be adjusted annually to conform to changes in tonnage.

In addition to the United States, which is the managing government, proportional contributions are made by the Governments of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. The new agreement will replace the present agreement whenever all of the governments concerned have signed.

Of all the peacetime hazards of the sea, none is more fearsome, unyielding, and treacherous than icebergs. The presence of these bergs in the heavily traveled shipping lanes of the North Atlantic, in an area of the heaviest fogs in the world, creates an extremely dangerous condition.

Prior to 1912, however, nothing was done toward establishing a system to warn ships of the location of icebergs, but on April 14 of that year the compelling necessity for the patrol was tragically brought home. Some 1,500 lives were lost on that date when the express passenger liner *Titanic*, on its maiden voyage, crashed into an iceberg and sank.

The U.S. Navy detailed two cruisers in that year to form the first ice patrol. The International Ice Observation and Ice Patrol Service in the North Atlantic was then created, and the United States was invited to operate the patrol with the expense to be borne by the 14 participating nations. The U.S. Coast Guard was designated as the responsible U.S. agency and since 1913 (with the exception of war years) has operated the Ice Patrol. Not a single vessel nor life has been lost because of collision with an iceberg during the years when the patrol has been operating.

At first the patrol consisted of a fleet of cutters that remained at sea during the danger season, screening the area and at times standing by particularly dangerous bergs to warn passing vessels. But the advent of long-range aircraft changed the structure of the patrol. Except in fog and bad weather an airplane has a great advantage over surface craft in sweeping the area and quickly determining from day to day the positions of the many bergs. It is estimated that 7,500 sizable bergs break off from the west Greenland glaciers each year, an average of 428 of which drift south of latitude 48 degrees (Newfoundland) and ap-

proximately 35 of which reach south of latitude 43 degrees (approximate latitude of Portsmouth, N.H.).

The use of cutters cannot be dispensed with entirely, however, because fog may obscure the surface of the most critical regions to airplanes for weeks at a time and strong currents may send bergs hundreds of miles from their originally sighted positions. Thus, when the weather is unsuitable for planes, the cutters replace them.

Headquarters at Argentia, Newfoundland, is the nerve center of the patrol. Its radios are in constant touch with the patrol units and merchant vessels crossing the area. Reports of ice sightings are received from many sources all over the northwestern Atlantic and are carefully analyzed to determine their actual and potential danger. Routine broadcasts of all ice conditions hazardous to shipping are made several times daily. Many more specific messages are sent to individual ships requesting detailed information. At headquarters the positions and courses of merchant ships traveling through the dangerous zone are charted, together with the positions of all dangerous bergs. The patrol commander thus has at hand a complete picture of the situation.

An idea that frequently occurs to the public is that icebergs can be destroyed by gunfire and mining, but this is without foundation. Gunfire has little or no effect, and the bergs are far too dangerous to board and blast. Neither can they be towed or pushed, and they cannot be rammed except in their last stages when they are rotten with slush. In the final analysis, these giants from the north can be eliminated only by nature, when they meet the warmer waters from the Gulf Stream. The Ice Patrol can only seek them out, watch them carefully and patiently, and make the best scientific prediction as to their future movements.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Federal Republic of Germany

Charter of the Arbitral Commission on property rights and interests in Germany (annex to convention on the settlement of matters arising out of the war and the occupation signed at Bonn May 26, 1952, as amended by the protocol on the termination of the occupation regime signed at Paris October 23, 1954). Entered into force May 5, 1955.

Accession deposited: Greece, November 4, 1955.

Japan

Treaty of peace with Japan. Signed at San Francisco September 8, 1951. Entered into force April 28, 1952. TIAS 2490.

Ratification deposited (with declarations): Ecuador, December 27, 1955.

North Atlantic Ice Patrol

Agreement regarding financial support of the North Atlantic ice patrol. Opened for signature at Washington January 4, 1956. Enters into force on the date on which it shall have been signed by all the 11 Governments named in the preamble.

Signature: United States, January 4, 1956.

North Atlantic Treaty

Agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for cooperation regarding atomic information. Signed at Paris June 22, 1955.¹

Notification of being bound by terms of the agreement: Netherlands, January 4, 1956.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954. TIAS 3266.

Ratification deposited: Greece, December 13, 1955.

Final protocol to the international telecommunication convention. Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1952. Entered into force January 1, 1954. TIAS 3266.

Ratification deposited: Greece, December 13, 1955.

Trade and Commerce

Protocol on terms of accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with annex A (schedules of the Contracting Parties) and annex B (schedule of Japan). Done at Geneva June 7, 1955. Entered into force September 10, 1955.

Notification of intention to apply concessions received: Norway (effective January 16, 1956).

BILATERAL

Colombia

Agreement for interchange of technical knowledge and skills for development of Cauca Valley region, pursuant to the general agreement for technical cooperation of March 5 and 9, 1951 (TIAS 2231). Effected by exchange of notes at Bogotá July 29, November 15 and 28, 1955. Entered into force November 28, 1955.

Haiti

Agreement providing assistance for Artibonite Valley project in Haiti. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington December 27 and 28, 1955. Entered into force December 28, 1955.

Japan

Agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington November 14, 1955.

Entered into force: December 27, 1955 (upon exchange of notes establishing that all procedures of the two governments necessary to give legal effect to the agreement have been completed).

Netherlands

Agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington July 18, 1955.

Entered into force: December 30, 1955 (the day after receipt by the United States of notification that constitutional approval has been obtained by the Netherlands).

¹ Not in force.

	Page
Africa. Future Status of Togoland (Bell, text of resolution)	100
Asia. Southeast Asia Pact Council To Meet at Karachi	84
Atomic Energy. United States and Germany Discuss Research Reactor Agreement	92
Brazil. Visit of President-Elect Kubitschek of Brazil (Dulles, Kubitschek)	86
Canada	
Approval of Recommendations for Controlling Levels of Lake Ontario (Jordan, Hoover)	89
U.S.-Canadian Commission Discusses Levels of Lake Ontario	92
Claims and Property. U.S. Asks Payment of Damages for Destruction of Navy Plane (text of note)	94
Congress, The. The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	79
Economic Affairs	
Advisers to U.S. Delegation to Tariff Negotiations	96
Approval of Recommendations for Controlling Levels of Lake Ontario (Jordan, Hoover)	89
Negotiations Concerning Debts of City of Berlin	93
New International Agreement on North Atlantic Ice Patrol	105
U.S.-Canadian Commission Discusses Levels of Lake Ontario	92
Europe. United States Position on Liberation of Captive Peoples (Hagerty)	84
France. Future Status of Togoland (Bell, text of resolution)	100
Germany	
Agreement With Germany on Defense Use of Technology	104
Negotiations Concerning Debts of City of Berlin	93
United States and Germany Discuss Research Reactor Agreement	92
International Information. United States Position on Liberation of Captive Peoples (Hagerty)	84
Israel. Israeli Action Against Syria (Lodge)	103
Military Affairs. U.S. Asks Payment of Damages for Destruction of Navy Plane (text of note)	94
Mutual Security	
Outlook for Free World in 1956 (Dulles)	84
Southeast Asia Pact Council To Meet at Karachi	84
Near East. Mob Violence in Amman and Jerusalem	85
Non-Self-Governing Territories. Future Status of Togoland (Bell, text of resolution)	100
Presidential Documents	
The State of the Union	79
United States Position on Liberation of Captive Peoples (Hagerty)	84
U.S. Recognition of Independence of the Sudan	85

	Page
Protection of Nationals and Property. Mob Violence in Amman and Jerusalem	85
Sudan. U.S. Recognition of Independence of the Sudan	85
Syria. Israeli Action Against Syria (Lodge)	103
Treaty Information	
Agreement With Germany on Defense Use of Technology	104
Current Actions	106
New International Agreement on North Atlantic Ice Patrol	105
U.S.S.R. U.S. Asks Payment of Damages for Destruction of Navy Plane (text of note)	94
United Kingdom. Future Status of Togoland (Bell, text of resolution)	100
United Nations	
Current U.N. Documents	104
Future Status of Togoland (Bell, text of resolution)	100
Israeli Action Against Syria (Lodge)	103
Summary of Accomplishments of Tenth General Assembly	97

Name Index

Bell, Laird	100
Dulles, Secretary	84, 86
Eisenhower, President	79, 84, 85
Hagerty, James C.	84
Hoover, Herbert, Jr.	91
Jordan, Len	89, 91
Kubitschek de Oliveira, Juscelino	86
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr.	103

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: January 2-8

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.
Press release issued prior to January 2 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 686 of December 9.

No.	Date	Subject
1	1/2	Eisenhower greeting to Sudan Commission.
2	1/2	Recognition of Sudan's independence.
*3	1/3	Dulles: death of Edward Wilber.
*4	1/3	Program for Kubitschek visit.
5	1/4	U.S.-German agreement on technology.
6	1/4	Advisers to GATT delegation.
7	1/4	Agreement on North Atlantic Ice Patrol.
8	1/5	Negotiations on Berlin's external debts.
9	1/5	Arrival of President-elect Kubitschek.
10	1/6	U.S.-German negotiations on atomic agreement.
11	1/6	Note to U.S.S.R. on damages for plane.
12	1/6	Second meeting of SEATO Council.
13	1/8	Mob violence in Amman and Jerusalem.

*Not printed.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Recent releases in the popular Background series . . .

The Union of Burma

This 16-page illustrated pamphlet describes the land and the people of Burma. Touching briefly on the past, this Background also describes the government and the Pydiwatha program of the new Burma. Concerning the position of Burma in world affairs, the pamphlet states that . . . "the people of Burma have long preferred to be left alone to develop their own resources. Today Burma's leaders realize the impossibility of such a position. As they view it the country is being forced into greater involvement in world affairs, and they are seeking ways in which Burma can strengthen the ties with its neighbors and make its leadership felt regionally."

Publication 5913

10 cents

Jordan

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in Western Asia is one of the nine sovereign Arab States with which the United States has direct relations. Geographically it occupies a central position in that vast area from the Mediterranean to the Arabian Sea known as the Middle East—the security of which is important to the interests of the free world and the United States. West of the Jordan River, the Kingdom encompasses a significant portion of the Holy Land. Here in this Background is a brief survey of this land with its rich traditions which has for centuries provided an important link in the trade between the East and the West.

Publication 5907

10 cents

Southeast Asia: Critical Area in a Divided World

Although it sprawls across a vast area more than 3,000 miles from east to west and more than 2,000 from north to south, Southeast Asia has less than half the actual land mass of the United States. Its population is about 10 million greater. The land form is varied, the population more so; and the configuration of the land has created barriers not only between countries but also between communities. This illustrated pamphlet discusses briefly the individual countries of this region—Burma, Thailand, Viet-Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines—and the beginnings of a pattern of collective security for the entire Pacific area.

Publication 5841

15 cents

These Background pamphlets may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Order Form

to: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed And:

\$.....
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me
copies

- ☐ *The Union of Burma*
☐ *Jordan*
☐ *Southeast Asia: Critical Area in a Divided World*

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State:

AVOID